



Attorney Docket No. 0756-2450

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Hideomi SUZAWA et al.

Serial No. 10/086,628

Filed: March 4, 2002

For: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND
MANUFACTURING METHOD
THEREOF

) Group Art Unit: 2814

) Examiner: D. Wille

) CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence is
being deposited with the United States Postal
Service with sufficient postage as First Class
Mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 30,
2005.

) Adrian M. Stanger

AFTER FINAL RESPONSE

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The Official Action mailed March 30, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on January 8, 2004; January 22, 2004; and March 10, 2004.

Paragraph 2 of the Official Action rejects claims 8, 9, 19, and 20 as obvious based on the combination of Na et al., Ono et al., and Williams et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because the Official Action has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the

Please
enter
LP (8/10/05)